



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Notes and Opinions.

The Many-Sided Moses.—Hon. Charles Francis Adams, in a note appended to his recent address at the dedication of the building of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, thus discusses the accomplishments of Moses: "Owing to the hold which the Hebrew theology has obtained on all modern thought, the standards of judgment usually applied to historical characters have not been applied to Moses. He has been treated as exceptional. Meanwhile, judged by those standards, it may not unfairly be questioned whether Moses was not the most many-sided human being of whom any record exists, and the one whose influence on the history of the race has been most far-reaching. He constitutes almost a class by himself in that he seems to have been equally great as a philosopher, a lawgiver, a theologian, a poet, a soldier, an executive magistrate, and a historian. Compare him, for instance, with Julius Cæsar, also a many-sided man, whose influence over human events is perceptible even to the present time. A consummate military commander and political organizer, Cæsar wrote his *Commentaries*. As a strategist he may have been superior to Moses; and yet it is very questionable whether he ever executed a more brilliant or successful movement than the march out of Egypt or the passage of the Red Sea. The campaigns of the Israelites seem to have been uniformly both planned and carried out in a very masterly way. On the other hand, as a literary product, the *De Bello Gallico* is in no way comparable to Exodus. As a philosopher, the authority of him who wrote the book of Genesis was undisputed until well into the present century; and is even now implicitly accepted by the great mass of those calling themselves Christians. The binding character of the decalogue is still recognized, and it lies at the basis of modern legislation. As a poet, Homer distinctly pales before the Israelite, while both Dante and Milton drew from him their inspiration. There is no epic which in sublimity of movement as well as human interest compares with the books of Moses. As a chief magistrate the Hebrew molded, or at least left his imprint on, a race which has proved the most marked and persistent in type the earth has yet produced. Jesus Christ was of it. Finally, as a historian,

while the learning and judgment of Moses would not stand the test of modern criticism, his narrative was accepted as incontrovertible until within the memory of those now living, and has passed into common speech.

“What other man in all recorded history presents such a singular and varied record?”

Such an appreciation is interesting, not alone as coming from one who believes that “no scholar or man of reflection now believes that Moses was any more inspired than Homer, Julius Cæsar, or Thomas Carlyle,” but also from its indifference—to use no stronger word—to current opinions as regards the Pentateuch. Is it, however, an overstatement?

The Correspondence between Professor Dods and Dr. Kerr.—The British press has been publishing a correspondence between Dr. Kerr, of Glasgow, and Professor Dods, of Edinburgh, relative to certain statements of the latter in an address given upon the *Bible and Criticism* as regards inaccuracies in the Bible. Dr. Kerr writes Professor Dods asking him to indicate some passages where the errors and discrepancies of which he speaks are to be found. Professor Dods replies that it is not his “business to point out errors in Scripture, but to show that, in spite of the errors pointed out, Scripture infallibly accomplishes its purpose of presenting Christ to men,” and refers his correspondent to certain books where he may get the information he desires. Dr. Kerr on the next day replies that he is well acquainted with books on biblical criticism, but desires Professor Dods himself to “indicate a dozen of the places where errors and discrepancies may be found,” and rather insists that it is the professor’s business to “state with clearness what the errors are, and where they may be found.” Whereupon Professor Dods replies that he judges Dr. Kerr is trying to drag him into controversy, and that, as his correspondent confessedly knows where to obtain the information he is seeking, he declines to enter into any controversy with one whose mind is evidently made up. The next day Dr. Kerr writes Professor Dods to the effect that Professor Dods is the one who has originated the controversy, that he has been in controversy for a quarter of a century, and that he insists that Professor Dods shall comply with the request which he has made. Whereupon Professor Dods replies that Dr. Kerr is mistaken in his statement that he (Professor Dods) believed the Word was “honeycombed with errors,” refuses to treat as a simple-minded inquirer a man who is evidently seeking controversy, reiterates his

belief in the infallibility of Scripture for the purpose for which it was given, reminds Dr. Kerr that the "utterance of calumnious statements is quite as iniquitous as mistaken opinions," and requests him to regard his letters as strictly private and for his own perusal. On the same day Dr. Kerr writes Professor Dods that he cannot possibly regard the letters as private, maintains that "the members of the Christian church will form their own judgment as to whether he is the author of calumnious utterances," and proceeds to publish the whole correspondence.

Queries: Is the higher critic under obligation to substantiate statements with facts, when requested? And is a minister of the gospel under any obligation to refrain from publishing a correspondence which was undertaken privately, and which he was expressly asked to regard as personal?

The Pharaoh Who was Not Drowned.—In the *Expository Times* of November there is an abstract of an address delivered by Professor Sayce, April 4, concerning the mummy discovered by Loret at Thebes. The readers of the BIBLICAL WORLD were given information about this mummy in April, 1899, and it can therefore hardly be said to be anything of great novelty, although it does not seem to have bulked very largely in the religious press until Professor Sayce put his *imprimatur* upon it. Archæology has generally been claimed by Professor Sayce as a protagonist against the ravages of higher criticism. In the present instance, as in the case of the stele of Menepthah, Professor Sayce makes interesting discoveries, but perhaps the most interesting thing of his discovery does not concern the royal mummy itself. From before the time of the writer of the 136th psalm, who declared that Jehovah "overthrew Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea," the ordinary, unarchæological reader of the Scriptures had supposed that Pharaoh was drowned as he pursued after his lost slaves. At least, the account relates that he went in person after the Israelites with his troops, that he came in sight of them, that Jehovah told Moses he would "get honor upon Pharaoh and upon all his host," that all Pharaoh's host went into the miraculously divided waters, and that the waters "returned and covered the chariots and the horsemen, even all the host of Pharaoh that went in after them into the sea. There remained not so much as one of them." Professor Sayce accepts the identification of the mummy found perhaps two years ago as that of the Pharaoh of the oppression, Menepthah II. Evidently he could not have been drowned in the Red Sea. We had suspected this before from discoveries in Egypt, but now Professor Sayce comes to

harmonize the two statements. The Psalmist and less inspired persons have all been mistaken. Moses did not mean us to infer that the Pharaoh was drowned. He either turned back, or simply came to the shore of the sea and watched his army drown. And this Professor Sayce regards as the archæological method of defending the historical accuracy of the Scriptures! Does he quite disbelieve that Pharaoh might have been drowned and his body recovered and afterward embalmed?

The Courage of the Bible Student.—Professor H. Schultz, in a recent *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, closes a review of Harnack's *Das Wesen des Christentums* with the wish that theologians not in sympathy with Harnack might be impressed through this book with the vital religious character given biblical Christianity by a complete recognition of the laws of modern historical and natural sciences; and expresses the belief that such scholars among the Protestants will not lay the book aside without having had new love aroused for the gospel, and a firmer confidence in the future of the church of the Reformation.

It is, indeed, here, if anywhere, that there is hope for intelligent faith. Not until the true significance of the Bible is understood will men cease to fear the work of men of the laboratory. There is courage and energy for him alone who can coördinate God's revelations. And the first step to such coördination is the recognition of the supplementary—not destructive—relation of each. The only man who knows of a conflict between science and the Bible is he who has identified the Bible with a mechanical theory of inspiration. The secret of the success of scientific Bible study in stimulating men to deeper confidence in God and Christ and the kingdom, to deeper personal piety, and to wider social service, lies just here: It has no fear of new facts; it has no fear for the Bible; it believes in a God who is still in his universe, a Christ who is still with his followers, and a revelation that will be complete only when men have exhausted divine truth.